

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Originally filed claims 54-63 have been amended and renumbered 25-34. In addition claim 35 is newly added. Claims 25-35 are now pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of the application.

The title of the application was objected to. Applicants have provided a new title and believe that the objection to the title has been overcome.

As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have amended the specification to make specific reference to the parent application, which reference was also made in the Application Data Sheet originally filed with the application.

The wording of each of the claims was objected to. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that each is directed to a probe card made in accordance with a method described in the claims. The claims are thus now in product-by-process format. Applicants therefore believe that the objection to the claims has been overcome.

Claims 54 and 55 (now renumbered as claims 25 and 26) were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as indefinite because certain terms lacked antecedent basis. Applicants have amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns and believe that this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 54-63 (now renumbered as claims 25-34) were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,701,474 to Cooke et al. ("Cooke"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 25 (formerly numbered as claim 54) is directed to a "probe card made by a method comprising": receiving over a network from a prospective customer information describing a wafer to be tested, generating from the received information a proposed probe card design for testing the wafer, and communicating over the network with the prospective customer regarding acceptability of the proposed probe card design. In contrast, Cooke does not mention or suggest making a probe card. Rather, Cooke is concerned solely with computer aided design of an integrated circuit. It should also be noted that Cooke fails to disclose the method recited in claim 25. For example, Cooke does not disclose receiving design information over a network from a prospective customer, generating a proposed design, and communicating over the network with the prospective customer regarding acceptability of the proposed design. For all of the foregoing reasons, Cooke fails to anticipate or render obvious independent claim 25.


Dependent claims 26-35 depend from claim 25 and are therefore also patentable over Cooke.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all of the claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicants' attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (801) 323-5934.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2004

By


N. Kenneth Burraston
Reg. No. 39,923

Kirton & McConkie
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
P.O. Box 45120
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-1004
Telephone: (801) 323-5934
Fax: (801) 321-4893